

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addease COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wopto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/552,221	08/25/2006	Colin Roy Tarry	198/43889/Case 522-PCT-US	6512
279 04282009 TREXLER, BUSHNELL, GIANGIORGI, BLACKSTONE & MARR, LTD.			EXAMINER	
			FUQUA, SHAWNTINA T	
105 WEST ADAMS STREET SUITE 3600		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CHICAGO, IL 60603			3742	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/28/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Application No. Applicant(s) 10/552 221 TARRY, COLIN ROY Office Action Summary Examiner Art Unit SHAWNTINA FUQUA 3742 -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS. WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2008. 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4) Claim(s) 1 and 3-10 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) 1 is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 3-10 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on 06 October 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Application/Control Number: 10/552,221 Page 2

Art Unit: 3742

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claims 6 and 10 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(e) as being in improper form because
a multiple dependent claim should refer to other claims in the alternative only and cannot depend
from other multiple dependent claims. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims have not
been further treated on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- Claims 6 and 10 recite the limitation "the supplementary rail" in lines 3 and 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all
 obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- Claims 3-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kochman et al (US6403935) in view of O'Grady (US6814889) and Applicant's admitted prior art.

Kochman et al discloses a flexible semi-conductive material in sheet form (25, Figure 7B) including spaced apart first rails (10, column 10, lines 55-60) coated with tin (column 5, lines 43-52) and a supplementary rail (18, Figures 7A, 7B, column 10, line 60-column 11, line 5). Kochman et al does not disclose a nickel based antifaying compound overlying the rails, rails applied via conductive ink or screen printing. O'Grady et al discloses a nickel based antifaying compound overlying the rails, and Applicant's admitted prior art discloses rails applied via conductive ink or screen printing (specification, page 1, lines 18-27, esp. line 26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included the antifaying compound of O'Grady et al along with providing rails by screen printing of conductive ink as disclosed by Applicant in the flexible heater of Kochman et al because, a nickel based antifaying compound and providing rails by screen printing of conductive ink allows for a more secure electrical connection.

Response to Arguments

 Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, and 3-10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claim1 is allowed.

Art Unit: 3742

Conclusion

 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SHAWNTINA FUQUA whose telephone number is (571)272-4779. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8-4;30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tu Hoang can be reached on (571) 272-4780. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

stf April 24, 2009 /Shawntina Fuqua/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3742